

Since 1991, Coast Guard seizures of cocaine are down 45 percent. Coast Guard seizures of marijuana are down 90 percent. The Clinton administration, unfortunately, has ignored a fundamental fact: Spending money on the antidrug effort does make a difference. When we make the antidrug fight a national priority, drug use does drop. Between 1981 and 1992 Federal spending on the drug war effort rose 700 percent. Over roughly the same period, drug use was cut in half.

But, tragically, the opposite has happened under the Clinton administration. Drugs have gotten cheaper. They are more easily available and more pervasive in the lives of our young people. Between 1993 and 1995, the retail price of a gram of cocaine fell during that 2-year period from \$172 to \$137. Over roughly the same period, answering a survey, the number of 8th graders who think it is bad to even try crack once or twice dropped from 61 percent to 51 percent. And overall teenage drug use is up 55 percent.

On measure after measure in the years 1993 and 1994, America's anticrime and antidrug effort lost ground. That was the Clinton administration's record of accomplishment. They faced a tough problem and had to make tough choices. The sad litany I have recited is the best they could do.

Now, moving to the third item I want to talk about, in 1995 there was a major change in the landscape of Federal crime-fighting policy. The new Senate came under new leadership. Over the last 16 months under that new leadership, a dramatically different effort on the issue of crime has emerged. Since January 1995, the majority leader, Senator DOLE, took over the helm of America's anticrime strategy. Here is America's new strategy for fighting crime: FBI agents, up 20 percent; DEA agents, up 15 percent; \$800 million in new funding for Federal prosecutors; \$3 billion in new funding for prisons; \$1 billion in grants to States and local communities so they can fight crime at the grassroots level from neighborhood to neighborhood to neighborhood.

Mr. President, that is a truly remarkable change. I do not believe it is just a coincidence. A pattern of differences as striking as this can lead to only one tenable conclusion. Only one major factor intervened between the dismal record of 1993 and 1994 and the truly remarkable resurgence in the Federal crime-fighting effort that has occurred over the last 16 months.

That one factor, Mr. President, is the new management in the Senate and the House. I suggest Senator Bob DOLE be given the credit he deserves for changing the culture of Washington in this very important way.

Mr. President, politics has been defined as the art of the possible. The best definition of leadership I ever heard is this: "Leadership is the art of changing the limits of what's possible."

Over the last 16 months, Mr. President, we have seen this happen in the

fight against crime. I think it is time that Senator DOLE got the recognition he deserves for a very, very impressive accomplishment. Further, Mr. President, I believe people should be paying more attention to actions and accomplishments than simply to election year conversions and all the rhetoric that they spawn.

The former chairman of the House Committee on Narcotics, a Democrat, once said he had "Never seen a President care less about drugs," referring to the President of the United States. The lackluster war on drugs is just one symptom of an overall abdication on the issue of crime itself.

Mr. President, as we prepare to say goodbye to Majority Leader DOLE, let me say I speak for many when I observe that we will miss his excellent leadership on this very vital and important issue. We owe him our thanks not for his words but, rather, for his actions.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEMPTHORNE). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FORD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT VOTES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, we probably all have been guilty at one time or another of getting a little carried away on the Senate floor when we are trying to present our position on an issue. I think we saw a little bit of that yesterday by those of us who want to protect Social Security, and I would like to take a minute to respond to some of those, I think, inflammatory remarks.

I think the junior Senator from Oklahoma was right on the edge when he was talking about the 33 Senators that had previously voted in opposition to a balanced budget which included the use of Social Security. It has been said that to treat your facts with imagination is one thing, but to imagine your facts is another. We saw just how big some people's imaginations were yesterday.

I was 1 of those 33. The junior Senator from Oklahoma accused me of coming to Washington and voting one way and going back to my State and talking another. I am sure he does not know how I talk in Kentucky. I am sure he does not follow me around. I am sure he does not take the paper clips from my newspapers to see how I am quoted in my local paper.

Mr. President, I thought we were beyond the pony express era. I thought that we were on C-SPAN and 60 million people could immediately see how you

vote and what you say and they would know that before you get home. I have represented my State, now, for almost 22 years here in the Senate. I have been fortunate to have been reelected by a large percentage. I think when I vote and I explain my vote to my people some may not like it but they understand the reason for it.

Mr. President, I voted for a balanced budget amendment until this time. Then we were labeled, yesterday, as BBA 6. So I am one of the BBA 6's now. I do not know exactly what that means, except when the leadership on the Republican side sat down in the Democratic Cloakroom, and with a fountain pen wrote how much money they would be taking from Social Security each of the next 7 years, how much they would be taking from Social Security to balance the budget, that is when I reneged. That is when I said if you want my vote, put a firewall in as it relates to Social Security. Now I have that piece of paper, Mr. President. It is in my file and I will keep it. It is the handwriting of some of the leadership on the Republican side, how many billions of dollars, and as I recall the last 2 years, roughly \$147 billion they were going to take out of Social Security trust fund.

Now, when the junior Senator from Oklahoma says those of us who voted "no" last time, the 33, did not want a balanced budget, I just disagree with that. How can he say I do not want a balanced budget amendment? All I say is build a firewall for Social Security. You could have 70-odd votes if you do that. It would be easy to pass. But, no, the Republicans want an issue. They want an issue. They do not want it passed. They lost a vote today for one reason and one reason only. You are talking about star wars, and you have one of the greatest minds as it relates to defense in this country in the Senate in SAM NUNN, the Senator from Georgia, who was vehemently opposed. He said you are mandating that we put it in to spend \$60 billion and you do not know whether it will work. Let us research it for another 3 years. You are not going to get it up any faster. Then in 3 years you will know it will work, and then let us do it. No, we were forced into the vote on the basis that we shall do it whether we know if it will work or not, and at a cost of \$60 billion, and that is right behind that attempted \$700 billion tax break—in one day. And the next day, they holler, "The sky is falling." So you have turned at least one Senator off as it relates to the political tactics being used on the Senate floor.

Now, we have 10 fictitious reasons for voting against the balanced budget amendment. There is only one reason, in my mind. We have heard a lot about a contract. We have heard a lot about a contract now for almost 2 years. Well, we had a contract with the farmers called the Freedom to Farm Act. Signed it, passed it. A contract. Within

7 weeks, you are breaking that contract. The House Agriculture Appropriations Committee was eliminating almost \$100 million out of the payments to the farmers that they thought they had signed up for next year. You are reducing WIC by having it frozen. You are reducing nutrition programs by \$300 million on the House side. Contracts are being broken. I thought both sides had agreed to a contract. Both sides were committed to it. Therefore, we find that we are already breaking contracts.

When you are going to use Social Security funding, then I think we are breaking a contract with those who are expecting that. Sure, we are having a bump in the road on Medicare. We all understand that. The President has submitted two budgets reducing part A. Now, everybody talks about Medicare and paints it with a broad brush. It is part A that is short, not part B. Part A is the hospital and part B is the doctor, if you want to put it into categories. So part A is the part having problems. Part B still has a surplus. Part B will have a surplus from now on, the way things are going.

So we have one part of Medicare to be fixed. Even now, there is a \$100 billion surplus in part A, as I understand it. If you continue to use it, over a period of time, that will be reduced to zero. You need to keep it at a level where it will not be reduced and where the level will stay the same over the next 7 years.

Mr. President, if Social Security were protected, we could pass the balanced budget amendment and get on with actually passing our spending bills. We hear a lot about how bad things have been. I have been here 22 years now. I did not see any vetoes, under the Republican administration, as it related to tax increases and spending increases. I did not see those vetoes. We did not have enough votes to override them, if the Republicans would have stayed together. But, no, we went from a \$900 billion deficit to \$5 trillion in 12 years under Republican leadership. During that time, Republicans had 6 years of control here in the Senate Chamber. Could you have supported a veto? Absolutely, you could have sustained a veto.

Now, Mr. President, I do not mind debating the issues, but I certainly hate to be singled out and it becomes a personal issue. As I say, the junior Senator from Oklahoma came very close to the edge of being challenged under the rules of the Senate yesterday. So I just hope that, as we debate the issues, we eliminate the personalities and the personal attacks. It is nice to have a picture of your grandson here on the Senate floor. I have five grandchildren. I enjoy grandchildren. But do you know something? It is hard for me to believe, as a grandfather, that if I watched my daughter give birth to a son, my grandson—as I read the RECORD and listened to him yesterday, in his first breath, it was handed to

him and the first thing he thought about is that this poor child owes \$18,000 in back taxes, or he has that debt on him. I would have thanked the Lord for my daughter coming through the delivery healthy. I would thank the Lord for being given a healthy baby before worrying about how much tax load or debt load that newborn baby had. Nevertheless, I am sure the taxpayers had something to do with paying for the picture of that grandson that was here on the Senate floor.

So here we are getting personal again, and I do not like it. The only way I know how to say to my colleagues that think the debate is about who supports a balanced budget—this is a debate about who wants to save Medicare. This is a debate about who wants to raid Medicare, who wants to cut the deficit, and that sort of thing. Those issues are fine. But when I am accused of voting one way here and going home and saying another thing—the day of the Pony Express is over. It is instantaneous what I say and do here, and it is getting to my constituents.

So while people are predicting doom and gloom again today, the BB-6 can point to a record of deficit reduction and a commitment to balance the budget, while protecting the pact we made with citizens to protect Social Security. So we passed a bill in 1990, under a Republican President, signed by him, not to include the Social Security trust fund.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, are we proceeding as in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, for a period of up to 10 minutes.

#### THE HEALTH INSURANCE REFORM BILL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, there were some comments made about where we are on the Kassebaum-Kennedy health reform bill. I wanted to just take a few moments of the Senate's time to review a little bit of the bidding on where we have been, where we are, and what the hope is in terms of the future.

Mr. President, as we know, this legislation was developed by Senator KASSEBAUM, myself, and other members of our Labor and Human Resources Committee in the wake of the 1994 debate on comprehensive health care. It was really reflective of the expressions that were made by Republicans and Democrats alike, both the now majority leader, Senator DOLE, and others on the Democratic side, who said, "Let us try to find common ground together, areas where we agree. Let us try, if we cannot do a comprehensive program, to at least shape a proposal that can make a difference to millions of Americans—particularly those with preexisting conditions—recognizing the importance of portability, moving from one job to another, being

able to carry the insurance if, for some reason, an individual loses their job, or the company closes down."

Over the period of really the last months, and even over recent years, that proposal has been working its way through the Labor and Human Resources Committee. It had virtually unanimous support of Republicans and Democrats alike, and it has worked its way through the Senate with 100 votes. Unanimity, Mr. President, 100 votes—a unanimous vote here in the Senate and in our committee. I find that to be an extraordinarily rare occasion, when you take something that can provide such a meaningful difference and provide relief for families and for working families, a measure that can make a very important difference, particularly to those with preexisting conditions.

The efforts of Senator KASSEBAUM and myself have been to try to keep the legislation clean—that is, to try to resist various amendments, in spite of the fact that we might have agreed with some of those provisions at other times. That was certainly true in my case with regard to the excellent proposals that were added to the measure by Senator DOMENICI and Senator WELLSTONE on mental health. I feel very strongly that it is about time that we treat mental health in the way that we consider other serious illnesses, and not make the consideration of mental health a stepchild in our health care policy areas.

Nonetheless, we had worked out a process where we were going to try to move ahead with the areas that we could agree on, so that we can move through this legislative process with that in mind. We accepted some matters that were overwhelmingly supported by Members of the Senate where there was no serious objection.

We accepted the mental health provisions. But it has always been the position of the Senator from Kansas and myself that we were going to be committed to a proposal that would provide just the measures which initially came out of the committee unless we were going to be able to convince our Members in the conference that we needed to make at least some progress in the areas of mental health.

Senator DOMENICI, Senator WELLSTONE, I must say Tipper Gore, who has been enormously interested in the areas of mental health, have all weighed in in terms of making the case once again of the importance of extending some protections to the area of mental health. That is an issue which I know is still under consideration by at least those that are meeting. I can point out for the Members of the Senate, that those meetings have not included the Members of this side of the aisle, but we have tried to work in a constructive way in at least getting some of these ideas forward for the consideration of those who are in the room.

I want to just mention parenthetically that there were some comments